

COMMISSIONERS  
BOB STUMP – Chairman  
GARY PIERCE  
BRENDA BURNS  
BOB BURNS  
SUSAN BITTER SMITH



0000157193

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION RECEIVED

October 30, 2014

2014 OCT 30 P 1:28

AZ CORP COMMISSION  
DOCKET CONTROL

Mr. Warren Feldman  
Covista, Inc.  
140 Little Street  
Belleville, NJ 07109

ORIGINAL

RE: Cancellation of CC&N/Docket Nos. T-03864A-14-0073/T-04229A-14-0073/T-03631A-14-0073/T-03490A-14-0073

Dear Mr. Feldman:

On April 22, 2014, Ionex Communications North, Inc. d/b/a Birch Communications ("Ionex") filed an application in the above Docket with the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") for approval of the transfer of customers from Covista, Inc. ("Covista") to Ionex. Decision No. 74778, dated October 24, 2014 granted the request and approved the process to cancel Covista's Certificate of Convenience and Necessity (CC&N) to provide resold long distance service granted in Decision No. 62638. In Compliance with that process, a copy of Decision No. 74778 is hereby provided to you for your reference.

If you are of the opinion that Covista's CC&N should not be cancelled, you have sixty (60) days from October 24, 2014 to file an objection to the cancellation of the CC&N and to request a Hearing. If no objection is received from you by December 23, 2014, Commission Staff will docket a Report and Order recommending cancellation of Covista's CC&N.

Please feel free to contact me at any time if you have any questions. I can be reached at 602-542-0856 or via email at [mconnolly@azcc.gov](mailto:mconnolly@azcc.gov).

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

OCT 30 2014

DOCKETED BY

Sincerely,

Matt Connolly  
Executive Consultant II  
Utilities Department

/mac  
Enclosure

1 BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

2 BOB STUMP

Chairman

3 GARY PIERCE

Commissioner

4 BRENDA BURNS

Commissioner

5 BOB BURNS

Commissioner

6 SUSAN BITTER SMITH

Commissioner

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

OCT 24 2014

DOCKETED BY

nr

8 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION )  
9 OF IONEX COMMUNICATIONS NORTH, )  
10 INC. D/B/A BIRCH COMMUNICATIONS )  
11 FOR APPROVAL OF THE TRANSFER OF )  
12 CUSTOMERS FROM LIGHTYEAR )  
NETWORK SOLUTIONS, LLC, ERNEST )  
COMMUNICATIONS, INC. AND COVISTA, )  
INC. )

DOCKET NOS. T-03864A-14-0073

T-04229A-14-0073

T-03631A-14-0073

T-03490A-14-0073

DECISION NO. 74778

ORDER

13  
14 Open Meeting  
October 16, 2014  
15 Phoenix, Arizona

16 BY THE COMMISSION:

17 FINDINGS OF FACT

18 1. On February 26, 2014, Ionex Communications North, Inc. d/b/a Birch  
19 Communications ("Ionex") filed a letter to advise the Arizona Corporation Commission  
20 ("Commission"), that Ionex has begun serving customers previously served by Lightyear Network  
21 Solutions, LLC. ("Lightyear"), Ernest Communications, Inc. ("Ernest") and Covista, Inc. ("Covista")  
22 as a result of the transactions described below. Ionex concluded that Commission approval was not  
23 required for Ionex to begin serving these customers due to the small size of the carriers involved in  
24 the transaction[s] (not Class A Utilities) and the recently amended Arizona Revised Statute ("A.R.S.")  
25 §40-285(F) and filed the letter for informational purposes and to provide contact information should  
26 any questions arise.

27 2. Upon receipt of the aforementioned filing, Staff discussed with representative counsel  
28 the need to address Arizona Administrative Code ("A.A.C.") R14-2-1904 et seq. (the "Slamming

Rules”) and A.A.C. R14-2-2001 et seq. (the “Cramming Rules”) in a customer transfer situation. As a result, on April 22, 2014, Ionex filed in this docket an application for a declaratory order from the Commission that the Commission’s Slamming Rules and Cramming Rules are inapplicable to the transfer of an entire customer base, provided that the transfer occurred in compliance with federal transfer requirements. Alternatively, Ionex requests a waiver of A.A.C. R14-2-1901-1913 and R14-2001-2011 in connection with the acquisitions of Lightyear, Ernest and Covista.

3. In support of this filing, Ionex provides the following information.

**Description of the Applicants**

Ionex Communications North, Inc. d/b/a Birch Communications

4. Ionex was issued a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity (“CC&N”) on January 29, 2014, to provide resold local exchange and long distance, and facilities-based long distance and local exchange telecommunications services in Arizona pursuant to Decision No. 74295. Ionex is a wholly owned subsidiary of Birch Communications, Inc. (“Birch”). Birch is a Georgia corporation headquartered at 3060 Peachtree Road NW, Suite 1065, Atlanta, Georgia, 30305. Birch and its subsidiaries are authorized to provide telecommunications services in all 50 states and the District of Columbia.

Lightyear Network Solutions, LLC

5. Lightyear is a Kentucky limited liability company which was headquartered at 1901 Eastpoint Parkway Louisville, KY, 40223. Lightyear Network Solutions, LLC was issued a CC&N to provide competitive resold and facilities-based local exchange and interexchange services via Decision No. 67435 on December 3, 2004.

6. On December 5, 2006, the Commission, in Decision No. 69171, cancelled the facilities-based long distance portion of Lightyear’s CC&N. On May 16, 2008, the Commission, in Decision No. 70342, cancelled the facilities-based and resold local exchange portion of Lightyear’s CC&N. On March 18, 2014, Lightyear submitted a Request for Cancellation of Long Distance Resale Authority in Docket No. T-04229A-14-0092 that is currently pending.

...

...

Ernest Communications, Inc.

7. Ernest was a Georgia corporation authorized to do business in Arizona in 1998. Ernest was granted a CC&N for authority to provide competitive resold local exchange telecommunications services in Decision No. 63142, dated November 16, 2000.

8. Ernest has not submitted an application to request a cancellation of its CC&N. Staff attempts to reach any representative of Ernest by phone revealed that the most recent contact number has now been routed to Birch Communications. An email sent to a company contact listed on Ernest's most recent Annual Report was returned undeliverable. A certified letter addressing the CC&N cancellation issue was mailed on June 18, 2014, to the last known contact and company address. The letter was returned by the U.S. Postal Service, unopened, to the Commission with the indication that the recipient was unknown.

9. Though required to file a bond, Staff could find no compliance filing indicating that Ernest had fulfilled with this requirement. The Commission Business Office confirmed no such bond exists.

Covista, Inc.

10. Covista was a New Jersey corporation with headquarters located at 225 East 8th Street, Suite 400, Chattanooga, TN, 37402. Covista, while under the name of Total Tel, Inc., was granted a CC&N in Decision No. 62638 by the Commission on June 9, 2000, to provide resold long distance service. Total Tel, Inc. subsequently changed its name to Covista and notified the Commission of such in Docket No. T-03490A-00-0930. On December 18, 2003, Covista's CC&N authority was expanded to include competitive facilities-based and resold local exchange services in Decision No. 66641. On August 6, 2008, upon Covista's request, the Commission cancelled Covista's authority to provide competitive facilities-based and resold local exchange services in Decision No. 70449.

11. Covista has not submitted an application to request a cancellation of its CC&N for interexchange service. Staff attempts to reach any representative of Covista by phone revealed that the most recent contact number is now out of service. An email sent to a company contact listed on Covista's most recent Annual Report was returned undeliverable. A certified letter addressing the CC&N cancellation issue was mailed on June 18, 2014, to the last known contact and company address. This letter was returned to the Commission with the indication that the forwarding address had expired. A second certified letter mailed on July 1, 2014, to the forwarding address was not returned nor did it elicit a response.

12. Covista was required to obtain a bond as a requirement in Decision No. 66641. However, in Decision No. 70449, the Commission noted that Covista never fulfilled this requirement and no additional ordering language was included directing Covista to obtain the bond.

**Description of the Transaction**

Lightyear Network Solutions, LLC

13. On May 10, 2013, Birch and Lightyear entered into an Asset Purchase Agreement pursuant to which Birch would purchase certain assets and customers from Lightyear. Birch purchased the following assets from Lightyear: certain customer accounts and receivables, certain customer agreements and contracts, certain vendor agreements and contracts, certain equipment and certain intellectual property. Birch has not assumed any of Lightyear's pre-closing liabilities or obligations. The Arizona portion of the asset and customer transfer anticipated by the Agreement was delayed pending receipt by Ionex of its certification to provide service in Arizona. On January 29, 2014, Ionex received certification to provide service in Arizona and the customer transfer anticipated by the Agreement is now complete. Lightyear served approximately 443 customers in Arizona.

14. Ionex has made all the necessary revisions to its rates, terms and conditions to incorporate Lightyear's current services and rates so that the affected customers will continue to receive the same services that they received without any immediate changes to their service offerings or rates. Ionex states that no changes to any customer contracts, if any, will occur as a result of the transaction, Ionex will provide Lightyear's customers with the same quality of service they have come to expect and all billing will be handled under the Birch name. Ionex further states that in compliance with federal rules governing the transfer of an entire customer base, Lightyear customers received notice of the carrier change along with a commitment from Ionex that there would be no immediate change to the rates, terms and conditions of their service as a result of the transfer.

Ernest Communications, Inc.

15. On May 30, 2013, Birch and Ernest entered into an Asset Purchase Agreement pursuant to which Birch purchased the assets and customers from Ernest. Birch purchased the following assets from Ernest: certain customer accounts and receivables, certain customer agreements and contracts,

...

1 certain vendor agreements and contracts, certain equipment and certain intellectual property. Birch,  
2 however, did not assume any of Ernest's pre-closing liabilities or obligations.

3 16. Ionex has made all the necessary revisions to its rates, terms and conditions to  
4 incorporate Ernest's current services and rates so that the affected customers will continue to receive  
5 the same services that they received without any immediate changes to their service offerings or rates.  
6 Ionex also states that Ionex will provide Ernest's customers with the same quality of service they have  
7 come to expect and all billing will be handled under the Birch name. Ionex further states that in  
8 compliance with federal rules governing the transfer of an entire customer base, Arizona Ernest  
9 customers, approximately 114, received notice of the carrier change along with a commitment from  
10 Ionex that there would be no immediate change to the rates, terms and conditions of their service as a  
11 result of the transfer.

12 Covista, Inc.

13 17. On November 30, 2012, Birch and Covista entered into an Asset Purchase Agreement  
14 pursuant to which Birch purchased certain assets and customers of Covista. Birch purchased the  
15 following assets from Covista: certain customer accounts and receivables, certain customer agreements  
16 and contracts, certain vendor agreements and contracts, certain equipment and certain intellectual  
17 property. Birch, however, did not assume any of Covista's pre-closing liabilities or obligations.

18 18. Ionex has made all the necessary revisions to its rates, terms and conditions to  
19 incorporate Covista's current services and rates so that the affected customers will continue to receive  
20 the same services that they received without any immediate changes to their service offerings or rates.  
21 Ionex states that Ionex will provide Covista's customers with the same quality of service they have  
22 come to expect and all billing will be handled under the Birch name. Ionex further states that in  
23 compliance with federal rules governing the transfer of an entire customer base, Arizona Covista  
24 customers, approximately 409, received notice of the carrier change along with a commitment from  
25 Ionex that there would be no immediate change to the rates, terms and conditions of their service as a  
26 result of the transfer.

27 ...

28 ...

**Request for Waiver of Slamming and Cramming Rules**

19. Ionex requests a declaratory order that the Slamming and Cramming Rules are inapplicable to the transfer of an entire customer base, provided the transfer occurred in compliance with federal transfer requirements. Alternatively, Ionex requests a waiver of A.A.C. R14-2-1901-1913 and R14-2001-2011 in connection with these acquisitions of Lightyear, Ernest and Covista customers.

**Complaints and Compliance**

20. The Consumer Services Section of the Utilities Division reports that there have been no complaints, inquiries, or opinions about any of the companies named in this Docket. According to the Corporations Division, Ionex and Ernest are in good standing, Lightyear is not in good standing as a Certificate of Cancellation was filed on March 3, 2014, and Covista is not in good standing as their 2013 Annual Report, due October 28, 2013, is delinquent. Ionex and Lightyear have filed their required Utilities Annual Reports while Ernest is delinquent in filing its 2013 Utilities Annual Report and Covista has not filed its 2001, 2012 or 2013 Utilities Annual Reports. The Compliance Section of the Utilities Division reports that Ionex, Lightyear, Ernest and Covista are in compliance.

**Staff's Analysis**

21. The Applicants seek a waiver of A.A.C R14-2-1901 to -1913, the Slamming Rules. In its application, Ionex noted that the customers of Lightyear, Ernest and Covista were provided notice of the carrier change in compliance with federal rules. The Lightyear notice was sent out on October 24, 2013, the Ernest notice on July 15, 2013, and the Covista notice on February 1, 2013. Staff reviewed the notices. Because the notices inform customers that the rates, terms and conditions of service will not change as a result of the proposed transactions and informs customers that they may subscribe to the telecommunications service provider of their choice, Staff believes the Commission's Slamming Rules should be waived in this matter.

**Staff Recommendations**

22. Staff believes the Commission's Slamming and Discontinuance Rules all apply to this transaction. However, based on the above, Staff recommends the following:

- A waiver of A.A.C. R14-2-1904, et seq. and any other applicable anti-slamming regulations that may be inconsistent with the Federal Communication Commission's ("FCC's") rules regarding the transfer of customer bases because the notice informs

1 customers that the rates, terms and conditions of service will not change as a result of  
2 this proposed transfer and informs customers that they may subscribe to the  
telecommunications service provider of their choice; and

- 3 • A waiver not be granted of A.A.C. R14-2-2001 et seq. cramming rules because the  
4 rates, terms and conditions of service will not change as a result of this proposed  
5 transfer.

6 23. Based on Staff's inability to make contact with a representative of Ernest or Covista,  
7 the Consumer Services Sections' report of Annual Report delinquencies for Ernest and Covista and  
8 the information contained in notices to customers of the transfers filed in this Docket by Ionex, Staff  
9 has concluded that Ernest and Covista no longer exist as business entities in Arizona. Neither Ernest  
10 nor Covista have requested cancellation of its CC&N but, given the preceding, Staff recommends the  
11 following process to commence cancellation of Ernest's and Covista's CC&Ns:

- 12 1) A copy of the Memo and proposed Order for this case be delivered to Ernest and  
13 Covista at their last known address and placed in their CC&N dockets (Docket Nos.  
14 T-03631A-98-0540 and T-03490A-98-0013, respectively).
- 15 2) Ernest and Covista be given sixty (60) days from the date of the Order in this Docket  
16 to object to cancellation of their CC&N and request a Hearing if they so desire.
- 17 3) A separate notice be sent to Ernest and Covista, with a copy of the Order attached,  
18 stating that they have sixty (60) days from the date of the Order to object to  
19 cancellation of their CC&N and request a Hearing or cancellation of their CC&N will  
20 occur.
- 21 4) If, after sixty (60) days have expired with no response from Ernest and/or Covista,  
22 Staff should docket a Report and Order recommending cancellation of Ernest's  
23 and/or Covista's CC&N.

#### 24 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

25 1. Ionex Communications North, Inc. d/b/a Birch Communications, Lightyear Network  
26 Solutions, LLC, Ernest Communications, Inc. and Covista, Inc. are public service corporations within  
27 the meaning of Article XV of the Arizona Constitution.

28 ...



1           2.       The Commission has jurisdiction over Ionex Communications North, Inc. d/b/a  
2 Birch Communications, Lightyear Network Solutions, LLC, Ernest Communications, Inc. and  
3 Covista, Inc. and the subject matter in this filing.

4           3.       The Commission, having reviewed the filing and Staff's Memorandum dated October  
5 3, 2014, concludes that it is in the public interest to grant approval as proposed and discussed herein.

6                               ORDER

7           IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Ionex Communications North, Inc. d/b/a Birch  
8 Communications' request for a waiver of A.A.C. R14-2-1904 et seq. and any other applicable anti-  
9 slamming regulations that may be inconsistent with the FCC's rules regarding the transfer of customer  
10 bases be and hereby is approved.

11 ...

12 ...

13 ...

14 ...

15 ...

16 ...

17 ...

18 ...

19 ...

20 ...

21 ...

22 ...

23 ...

24 ...

25 ...

26 ...

27 ...

28 ...

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Ionex Communications North, Inc. d/b/a Birch  
2 Communications' request for a waiver of A.A.C. R14-2-2001 et seq. be and hereby is denied.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a process shall commence to cancel Ernest  
4 Communications, Inc.'s and Covista, Inc.'s CC&Ns consistent with Finding of Fact 23.

5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately.

6 **BY THE ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

7  
8   
9 CHAIRMAN

  
COMMISSIONER

10  
11   
12 COMMISSIONER

  
COMMISSIONER

  
COMMISSIONER

13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, JODI JERICH, Executive  
14 Director of the Arizona Corporation Commission, have  
15 hereunto, set my hand and caused the official seal of this  
16 Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of  
17 Phoenix, this 24th day of October, 2014.

18   
19 JODI JERICH  
20 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

21 DISSENT: \_\_\_\_\_

22 DISSENT: \_\_\_\_\_

23 SMO:MAC:sms\MAS  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 SERVICE LIST FOR: IONEX COMMUNICATIONS NORTH, INC. D/B/A BIRCH  
2 COMMUNICATIONS, LIGHTYEAR NETWORK SOLUTIONS, LLC,  
3 ERNEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC., AND COVISTA, INC.  
4 DOCKET NOS. T-03864A-14-0073, T-04229A-14-0073, T-03631A-14-0073 AND T-  
5 03490A-14- 0073.

6 Joan S. Burke  
7 Law Office of Joan S. Burke  
8 1650 N. First Avenue  
9 Phoenix, AZ 85003

10 Angela F. Collins  
11 Cahill Gordon & Reindel LLP  
12 1990 K. Street, N.W.  
13 Suite 950  
14 Washington, District of Columbia 20006

15 Mr. Steven M. Olea  
16 Director, Utilities Division  
17 Arizona Corporation Commission  
18 1200 West Washington Street  
19 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

20 Ms. Janice M. Alward  
21 Chief Counsel, Legal Division  
22 Arizona Corporation Commission  
23 1200 West Washington Street  
24 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

25 Ms. Lyn Farmer  
26 Chief Administrative Law Judge, Hearing Division  
27 Arizona Corporation Commission  
28 1200 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007